



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,265	08/07/2006	Michael Mittelstein	NEOME-019A2US	3349
Robert D Buyan Stout Uxa Buyan & Mullins 4 Venture Suite 300 Irvine, CA 92618				
EXAMINER				
PEFFLEY, MICHAEL F				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3739				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/26/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/560,265

**Applicant(s)**

MITTELSTEIN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Michael Peffley

**Art Unit**

3739

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1.6-25 and 27-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1.6-25 and 27-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/9/05 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3739

Applicant's amendments and comments, received March 9, 2009, have been fully considered by the examiner. The following is a complete response to the March 9, 2009 communication.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 21 and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities: there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the cannula" in these claims. These claims should be amended to depend from claim 20 which recites a cannula. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 14-19, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haissaguerre et al (6,086,629).

Haissaguerre et al disclose a device for cutting or coagulating tissue comprising an elongate member (28) having a distal end, and a right foot member (36) and a left foot member (34) extending angularly from the distal end of the elongate member (see Figure 1). Each foot member includes an upper surface and a lower surface with an electrode located on the upper surface of each foot member (see Figure 6). An electrically and thermally insulating covering (108,110) is formed on each foot member, particularly covering the

Art Unit: 3739

lower surface and part of the top surface (see Figure 6). There is a space between the foot members (Figure 6) and the electrodes are used to treat tissue located above the open space. The electrodes are connected to an RF energy source, and the foot members are part of a bifurcated member (i.e. the entire distal tip) extending from the distal end of the catheter. It is noted that Haissaguerre et al disclose embodiments whereby the electrodes extend directly from the elongate member in a bifurcated fashion (figures 19-21). Regarding claim 8, the electrodes are located on top of the insulating covering (see Figure 6), and Haissaguerre et al disclose lumens (85,87) for providing fluid to the electrodes (col. 8, lines 23-30).

Applicant's claim 14 is drawn to a product-by-process claim and the structure of Haissaguerre et al is deemed to meet the structure of the product. The process by which the structure is made does not patentably distinguish over the Haissaguerre et al reference. See MPEP 2113.

Regarding claims 15-19, Haissaguerre et al clearly disclose a handle (4 – Figure 1), from which the elongate member extends. The device is inherently deemed separable such that the elongate member is releasably attached to the handpiece. It is noted there is no structure associated with this broad recitation of a releasable relationship. The handpiece and elongate member are also deemed inherently autoclavable. There is no requirement that they need be functional after such a treatment, nor any limitation describing the autoclavable nature such that they may be reused.

Art Unit: 3739

The method of using the Haissaguerre et al device to treat tissue is fully disclosed throughout the specification and the drawings.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 12, 13 and 28-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haissaguerre et al ('629) in view of the teaching of Jahns et al (2002/0002372).

Regarding claim 10, as noted above, haissaguerre et al disclose a lumen for providing a fluid to tissue. however, there is no disclosure of another lumen for aspirating fluid.

Jahns et al, as addressed in the previous Office action, teach that it is generally known to provide RF electrode devices with lumens for providing aspiration and fluid delivery to irrigate the electrode and remove unwanted fluids and debris (paragraphs 0040-0045). Regarding claims 12 and 13, Jahns et al also disclose a wide variety of materials used making/coating the electrosurgical device (paragraphs 0034, 0039, 0065 and 0066). The examiner maintains that the use of any well known polymer material as the insulative portion of a medical device would be an obvious design consideration.

Art Unit: 3739

Regarding claim 29-39, Haissaguerre et al disclose uses of the device to treat cardiac tissue. Jahns et al disclose a similar device for treating cardiac tissue, and also disclose alternative uses such as the treatment of kidney, liver, lung, skin and muscle tissue (para. 0031). The examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the wide variety of tissue on which an RF device may be utilized. Moreover, applicant's specification discloses a wide array of uses with no criticality or unexpected result associated with any particular use. The use of an RF device to treat any desired tissue is deemed an obvious consideration for the skilled artisan.

To have provided the Haissaguerre et al device with an aspiration lumen for removing fluid and debris from the treatment site would have been an obvious modification for one of ordinary skill in the art, particularly since Jahns et al fairly teach that it is known to provide RF devices with both irrigation and aspiration capabilities. Further, to have formed the Haissaguerre et al device using any well known polymers for the insulative portions is deemed an obvious design consideration, and use of the device to treat any desired tissue site is deemed obvious as asserted in the paragraph above.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haissaguerre et al ('629).

As asserted above, Haissaguerre et al disclose a handle associated with the elongate member. The examiner maintains that any handle member may be deemed "releasably attached" to a catheter portion such as shown by

Art Unit: 3739

Haissaguerre et al. Again, there is no recitation of the structure for such a releasable attachment. However, the examiner also maintains that it is generally well-known in the art to provide devices as either integral components or as discrete elements that may be readily separated for cleaning and/or reuse. Such a modification is deemed an obvious design expedient and is well documented throughout the art. There is no disclosure of a novel connection between the components, only that they may be separable as is generally known in the medical field. As such, making the Haissaguerre et al device as an integral, single body device or as a multiple component device that may be readily disassembled and reassembled is deemed an obvious design selection that would be well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Claims 20-24 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haissaguerre et al ('629) in view of the teaching of Underwood et al (6,293,961).

Haissaguerre et al fail to disclose a cannula and/or endoscope components that may be used to introduce the device into the body. The examiner maintains that it is generally well-known to use endoscopes (and/or cannulas) for introducing devices in a minimally invasive procedure. To that end, Underwood et al disclose an alternative RF electrode device, and specifically teach that the device may be provided to a treatment site using endoscopic guidance (Figure 17).

To have provided the Haissaguerre et al device with an endoscope or cannula to facilitate entry of the device to a desired internal tissue area would have been an obvious consideration for one of ordinary skill in the art, particularly since Underwood et al fairly disclose the known use of an endoscope to provide a similar RF device to treatment sites.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will



Art Unit: 3739

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Peffley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4770. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 7am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Peffley/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3739

/mp/

Application/Control Number: 10/560,265

Page 9

Art Unit: 3739

August 21, 2009